ATTACHMENT A
REMARKS

Before considering the rejection on prior art, it is noted that several minor changes have been made in the specification to correct obvious minor errors. In addition, minor changes have been made in some of the claims which similarly correct minor errors or improve the form of the particular claim in question. For example, claim 11 has been amended in line five (5) thereof to change "input " and "output" to -- input means -- and -- output means --, respectively, in order to provide agreement with the earlier recitations in the claim.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(b) as being "anticipated by" the Kiko et al reference ("Kiko"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, as a matter of housekeeping, it is noted that the rejection here is apparently a rejection of claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 since each of these claims is treated in the rejection.

Turning to the merits of the rejection, in rejecting claims 1 and 11, the claimed "surge protection circuit" is read as reference numeral 10. Reference numeral 10 actually indicates the overall telecommunication system. The Kiko system does indeed include two surge protection circuits 26 but it is respectfully submitted that the high-pass filter 30 of Kiko is clearly not connected as claimed. In particular, high-pass filter 30 is connected to the input of one of the surge protectors 26 and not between "an input for combined AC and powerline signals" and "at least one output connected to the surge protection circuit" and is not "arranged such that powerline networking signals can pass through the surge protection circuit without being attenuated by the surge protection circuit." In this regard, it is evident from Figure 1 that the signals from modem 28 that pass through the high-pass filter 30 also pass through the surge protector 26. The Examiner has made reference to lines 50-63 of column 4 but these lines merely provide that the central office 12 includes a telephone office switch 20 and an ISP 22 and that the "ISP 22 transmits ADSL data signals to a modem 28 which are then sent to the telephone lines 16 via a high-pass filter 30 and the surge protector 26." Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 11 patentably distinguish the present invention from the Kiko reference.

Claims 4-7 and 12-15 have been rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being "unpatentable over" Kiko in view of Safraoui or Asprey." This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, these claims are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of claims 1 and 11. Further, filter stage 11 in Safraoui to which the Examiner makes reference is actually designed to "remove high frequency signals" rather than pass high frequency signals. Moreover, even if Safraoui did disclose a high-pass filter comprising a pair of capacitors of values similar to that claimed, there would be no basis for combining the teachings of the Safraoui reference, which relates to a high power and high voltage power supply including a non-resonant step-up circuit, with the impedance blocking filter circuit of the Kiko reference. Similar remarks apply to the Asprey patent which discloses capacitors which are "coupled between the power source from a computer 28 and a ground potential" and which provide for "high frequency noise to be passed to ground potential." Moreover, given that Asprey relates to a temperature compensated extended range computer communications link, there is no basis in either Kiko or Asprey for combining the teachings of the two references.

Finally, it is noted that a number of the other dependent claims, which are, of course, patentable for the same reasons as parent claims 1 and 11, are also separately patentable. For example, claims 2 and 3 and claims 16 and 17, which recite the rails associated with the inputs and outputs claimed, further define over the Kiko reference.

Allowance of the application in its present form is respectfully solicited.

END REMARKS